



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,369	07/31/2003	Ullas Gargi	200207387-1	2127
22879	7590	03/09/2006	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				ONI, OLUBUSOLA
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2168

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/631,369 Examiner OLUBUSOLA ONI	ART UNIT 2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/31/2003</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication: Application, filed on 07/31/2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claim invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In claims 1-21, 23-31 and 33-50, the “method” is recited; however all method claimed are abstract ideas not practical application, therefore it not limited to tangible, patent-eligible subject matter.

In claims 22, 32 and 51, a “system of organizing” is recited; however, system claimed comprises only software components. However, it is a computer software per se.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Platt et al. (Pub No U.S 2003/0009469) hereinafter “Platt”.

For claim 1, Platt teaches “a method of organizing a collection of objects, comprising: segmenting a sequence of objects into object clusters based on comparisons of successive object intervals to weighted measures of cluster extent”(See paragraph [0012, 0034-0036]), “and comparisons of successive object intervals to weighted measures of cluster object density” (See paragraph [0035-0037, 0049]).

For claim 2, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Platt teaches “wherein measures of cluster extent correspond to spans of recorded generation times over which objects in the clusters respectively extend”(See paragraph [0012, 0037,0041, 0045, 0058-0059]).

For claim 3, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above, Platt teaches “wherein measures of cluster extent correspond to spans of recorded generation locations over which objects in the clusters respectively extend” (See paragraph [0034, 0037,0046, 0045, 0052-0055]).

For claim 4, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claims 1 above. Platt teaches “wherein measures of cluster object

density correspond to average measures of time intervals between successive objects in the clusters" (See paragraph [0045]).

For claim 5, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Platt teaches "wherein measures of cluster object density correspond to averages of space intervals between successive objects in the Clusters" (See paragraph [0045-0046, 0053]).

For claim 6, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Platt teaches "wherein segmenting the object sequence comprises merging consecutive objects into a given cluster until an interval between a candidate object and a preceding object in the given cluster exceeds a threshold computed based on a weighted measure of the extent of the given cluster, at which point a new cluster is initiated with the candidate object" (See paragraph [0060-0063])

For claim 7, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Platt teaches "wherein segmenting the object sequence comprises merging consecutive objects into a given cluster until an interval between a candidate object and a preceding object in the given cluster exceeds a threshold computed based on a weighted measure of object density in the given

cluster, at which point a new cluster is initiated with the candidate object" (See paragraph [0060-0063]).

For claim 8, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Platt teaches "wherein weights applied to the measures of cluster extent decrease with increasing cluster size" (See paragraph [0072]).

For claim 9, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Platt teaches "wherein weights applied to the measures of cluster object density decrease with increasing cluster size"(See paragraph [0072]).

For claim 10, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Platt teaches "further comprising customizing at least one of the weights applied to the measures of cluster extent based on an analysis of objects in the cluster" (See paragraph [0040]).

For claim 11, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 10 above. Platt teaches "wherein at least one weight is customized based on a fractal dimension estimate for context-related meta data associated with objects in the collection" (See paragraph [0040-0042])

For claim 12, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument given above for rejected claim 1 above. Platt teaches “further comprising customizing at least one of the weights applied to the measures of cluster object density based on an analysis of objects in the cluster”(See paragraph [0040]).

For claim 13, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 12 and are similarly rejected.

For claim 14, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument given above for rejected claim 1 above. Platt teaches “wherein segmenting the sequence of objects further comprises comparing object density of a given cluster including a candidate object with a weighted measure of object density for the given cluster without the candidate object” (See paragraph [0059-0060]).

For claim 15, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 4 and are similarly rejected.

For claim 16, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 5 and are similarly rejected.

For claim 17, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 14 above. Platt teaches “wherein the measure of object density corresponds to a moving average density of objects”(See paragraph [0059-0060]).

For claim 18, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 9 and are similarly rejected.

For claim 19, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Platt teaches “wherein objects are segmented beginning at a first end of the object sequence” (See paragraph [0058-0060]).

For claim 20, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 19 above. Platt teaches “wherein objects are further segmented beginning at a second end of the object sequence” (See paragraph [0058-0060]).

For claim 21, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Platt teaches “wherein the sequence to be segmented includes objects of the following types: text, audio, graphics, still images, video and business events”(See paragraph [0003]).

Claim 22 is essentially the same as claim 1 except it set forth the limitation as “a system organizing” rather than “a method of organizing”, and therefore are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1.

For claim 23, Platt teaches “a method of organizing a collection of objects, comprising segmenting objects from the collection into clusters; extracting context-related meta data associated with the objects and parsable into multiple levels of a name hierarchy” (See paragraph [0037, 0059]); “and assigning names to clusters based on the extracted context-related meta data corresponding to a level of the name hierarchy selected to distinguish segmented clusters from one another” (See paragraph [0035, 0036, 0040, 0046]).

For claim 24, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 23 above. Platt teaches, “wherein names are assigned to clusters based on the extracted context-related meta data corresponding to a highest level of the name hierarchy that distinguishes clusters from each other” (See paragraph [0035-0037]).

For claim 25, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 23 above. Platt teaches “wherein the context-related meta data corresponds to object generation times” (See paragraph [0012, 0037, 0041, 0045, 0058-0059]).

For claim 26, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 23 above. Platt teaches “wherein the context-related meta data corresponds to object generation locations”(See paragraph [0034, 0037,0046, 0045, 0052-0055]).

For claim 27, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 26 above. “wherein the context-related meta data corresponds to recorded information relating to country, city, and state of object generation” (See paragraph [0034-0036]).

For claim 28, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 23 above. Platt teaches “wherein the context-related meta data corresponds to both object generation times and object generation locations” (See paragraph [0012, 0034, 0037,0041, 0045, 0046, 0052-0055, 0058-0059]).

For claim 29, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 23 above. Platt teaches “further comprising automatically naming objects in a given cluster based on the name assigned to the given cluster” (See paragraph [0035-0038]).

For claim 30, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 29 above. Platt teaches “wherein the objects in the given cluster are named automatically in accordance with a chronological ordering of the objects in the given cluster” (See paragraph [0035-0038]).

For claim 31, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 29 above. Platt teaches “further comprising storing objects in the given cluster in a tree structure organized by cluster and labeled in accordance with the assigned names” (See paragraph [0035-0038]).

Claim 32 is essentially the same as claim 23 except it set forth the limitation as “a system organizing” rather than “a method of organizing”, and therefore are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 23.

For claim 33, Platt teaches “accessing a sequence of objects segmented into clusters each including multiple objects arranged in a respective sequence in accordance with context-related meta data associated with the objects”(See paragraph [0034-0037]); “selecting for each object cluster at least two constituent objects representative of beginning and ending instances in the corresponding object sequence”(See paragraph [0059-0060]) ; “and graphically presenting the selected representative objects of each cluster” (See paragraph [0072-0077]).

For claim 34, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 33 above. Platt teaches “further comprising graphically presenting a stack of partially overlapping images representative of multiple objects in a cluster in response to user input”(See paragraph [0076-0077]).

For claim 35, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 34 above. Platt teaches “further comprising revealing an increased portion of a given representative image in the stack in response to detection of a user-controlled display icon positioned over the given representative image” (See paragraph [0076-0077]).

For claim 36, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 33 above. Platt teaches “wherein the representative objects of any given cluster are presented closer to each other than to the representative objects of other clusters”(See paragraph [0072-0077]).

For claim 37, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 33 above. Platt teaches “further comprising merging objects of one cluster into an adjacent cluster in response to user input” (See paragraph [0076]).

For claim 38, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 37 above. Platt teaches “wherein objects of one cluster are merged into an adjacent cluster in response to dragging and dropping of the objects to be merged” (See paragraph [0076]).

For claim 39, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 37 above. Platt teaches “wherein the objects of the one cluster are merged into the adjacent cluster in response to user selection of an icon for merging the clusters” (See paragraph [0076]).

For claim 40, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 33 above. Platt teaches “further comprising presenting a graphical representation of distributions of objects in the clusters” (See paragraph [0076-0077]).

For claim 41, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 40 above. Platt teaches “wherein a object distribution for a given cluster is presented as object instances plotted along an axis corresponding to a scaled representation of the context-related extent spanned by the given cluster”(See paragraph [0064-0073]).

For claim 42, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 40 above. Platt teaches “further comprising splitting a given cluster in response to user selection of a point in the representation of the object distribution presented for the given cluster”(See paragraph [0075]).

For claim 43, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 40 above. Platt teaches “further comprising automatically splitting a given cluster into two or more clusters in response to user input” (See paragraph [0075]).

For claim 44, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 43 above. Platt teaches “wherein the given cluster is automatically split into a user-selected number of sub-clusters”(See paragraph [0075]).

For claim 45, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 43 above. Platt teaches “wherein the given cluster is automatically split based on relative sizes of intervals between successive objects in the given cluster”(See paragraph [0072-0075]).

For claim 46, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 25 and are similarly rejected.

For claim 47, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 26 and are similarly rejected.

For claim 48, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 21 and are similarly rejected.

For claim 49, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument given above for rejected claim 33 above. Platt teaches “further comprising graphically presenting at least one link to an object of a cluster arranged in a sequence in accordance with time-related meta data in a calendar format”(See paragraph [0076-0077]).

For claim 50, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument given above for rejected claim 33 above. Platt teaches “further comprising graphically presenting at least one link to an object of a cluster arranged in a sequence in accordance with location-related meta data in a map format”(See paragraph [0040, 0076-0077]).

For claim 51, Platt teaches “ access a sequence of objects from the collection segmented into clusters each including multiple objects arranged in a respective sequence in accordance with context-related meta data associated with the objects” (See paragraph [0034-0037]); “select for each object cluster at least two constituent

objects representative of beginning and ending instances in the corresponding object sequence" (See paragraph [0059-0060]); "and graphically present the selected representative objects of each cluster on a screen with the representative objects of any given cluster presented closer to each other than to the representative objects of the other clusters" (See paragraph [0072-0077])

CONCLUSION

5. The following prior art cited on the PTO-892 form, not relied upon, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLUBUSOLA ONI whose telephone number is 571-272-2738. The examiner can normally be reached on 7.30-5.00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIM, VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KBP

OLUBUSOLA ONI
Examiner
Art Unit 2168



**TIM VO
PRIMARY EXAMINER**